

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1 through 15 are pending in the application and the Examiner rejected all claims.

Claim Rejections, 35 U.S.C. §112

In item 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is traversed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claims contain subject matter that was not described in the specification. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that the limitation "single-phase" training signal is not referenced or supported in the specification.

Applicant acknowledges that the precise phrase "single-phase training signal" is not used in the specification. However, reference to the specification makes it clear that the training signal S_T is indeed a single phase training signal; if it were otherwise, a calculation would be shown whereby the phase offset is calculated and included as part of the training signal. Instead, the equations referenced in the present invention show the use of a "pure" training signal, that is, a training signal sent from the subscriber to the service provider without a phase adjustment added thereto. As described in the specification, the phase offsets are calculated by modulator 16 (see page 7 of the specification) based upon the already-transmitted-and-received training signal S_T .

As noted in the prior response, this is in direct contrast with both of the Pillozzi references, which teach the transmission of a two-phase training signal comprising the original signal plus a phase offset signal. Simply, the present invention transmits a training signal and then adjustments to that signal are calculated after receipt, while the Pillozzi references transmit a dual phase (original plus phase offset) signal, i.e., the adjustments are made before receipt.

The specification clearly supports applicant's claiming of a single-phase training signal being sent from the subscriber to the service provider. While considered unnecessary, the applicant will amend the specification to include specific reference to the phrase "single-phase" if doing so will overcome the rejection; however, since it is clearly understandable to one of ordinary skill in the art that the training signal transmitted from the subscriber to the service provider is a single-phase training signal, applicant does not feel that such an addition is needed.

With respect to the differences between the claimed invention and the art cited by the Examiner, applicant incorporates the previously presented arguments by reference hereto.

Conclusion

The present invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

PATENT

Application No. 09/636,455


Docket No. Chou 1-1-4

Page 4

Enclosed herewith, in duplicate, is a Petition for extension of time to respond to the Examiner's Action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 19-5425.

Respectfully submitted

November 16, 2004
Date


Mark D. Simpson, Esquire
Registration No. 32,942

SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP
2600 ARAMARK Tower
1101 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107

Telephone: (215) 923-4466
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189